

Acton Historic District Commission
Meeting June 16, 2010
Special Meeting
Minutes

RECEIVED
JAN 27 2011

Present were Ron Rose (RR), Scott Kutil (SK), Michaela Moran (MM), David Barrat (DB). Mike Gowing, BoS Liaison.. Joe Levine, Lou Levine present on behalf of the applicant.

TOWN CLERK, ACTON

Same agenda items as last night: applications for Lothrop Mill 1015 & 1016.

Typist [TF] comments/questions in brackets and parentheses below.

Meeting called to order 7:30 pm.

MM spoke to Nina Pickering Cook and she said that Nina was willing to write something like Lou submitted last night at 15th meeting.

RR wants to return to 2nd floor window beds and freeze boards. RR says there might be some code issues for how low the windows can be and if we drop them then they might change shape. MM said that RR might act as a liaison with Dan Barton to decide these things. Lou Levine also mentioned that there would be field requests, during construction, there would be a choice and RR would be involved.

MM asked the applicant if we can have an additional week to write up the decision. Joe said he did not know. Lou said that he thought they were favorably disposed.

Roofing material is what was used on River St. Windows from the cut shed with the applications. Composite louvered shutter with low profile shutter hardware, painted. Front doors are painted. MM asked if we want to use the fiberglass doors since they are so close to the street. MM said that Davis Place doors are fiberglass and front the street, and he said eh wants to paint them. If we decide to accept that we need to say why. We have decided to [[notes blank]]

Side porches should have similar roofing, balustrades, and posts but are allowed to have simpler newel posts. SK asked about having language about the size of the handrails. MM said that where a handrail is necessary or a guardrail are used, they should be proportional to the newels and guardrails.

If the decks are further away than ?[60? 100? can't read it] feet they are minimally visible from the public, and therefore, we approved the pressure treated soo deck similar to that one.

At 8:40, members of the Conservation Commission, Chair Tom Tidman and another member were present to discuss additional setbacks which would put some pat of the building beyond the wetlands buffer. MM showed the ConsCom members the plans and summarized the HDC's position. There are 5 houses that the HDC wants to push back closer to the 20 ft setback limit, mitigate height and allow possible tree cover to develop. ConsCom member Terry asked what square footage is. Applicant answered 2,200 sq ft.

Lous summarized what the thinking was when they went before ConsCom. Terry said there were a lot of iterations of this plan and that it was a tight plan. Issues they dealt with was the environmental jitter (?) buffer. They can come back and make an appeal.

Bio-retention wells

Joe Levine said that the further back we push the house the more the homeowners will encroach on the wetlands. Lou said that his understanding was that crushed stone don't work in the wetlands area. RR said the driveways could be reconfigured and Lou Levine said that these driveways were configured very tightly and everything was thought out.

Lou reviewed what setbacks would be required. Tom Tidman said that perhaps they could make the roofs smaller.

Lou said that they are willing to plant trees and Tom asked if the HDC is allowed to dictate the type of trees.

Lets return to the exterior features list.

1x4 floorboards, stained mahogany.

Findings:

We have received separate applications for foundations. And for the building themselves.

- a) both have to be considered together
- b) we liked the high quality and aesthetic quality
- c) size and scale out of character
- d) houses are near 36 ft. HDC can not change
- e) out of character styles for the vicinity, but it does not create a precedent. Our ability to mitigate size and massing is further restricted by the wetlands to the rear
- f) SAV zoning requires xxx between 10 ad 20 ft.
- g) additions on one story porches and bringing down mass, but not conceal it.
- h) trees and foliage are required substitutes ? As trees is necessary to ???
- i) subdivisions in Acton require street trees every 50ft.
- j) xx?hose? Are appropriate to district, it is necessary to maximize setbacks
- k) applicant has verbally indicated that the houses are .4 (FAR?) or less

Conditions:

NOTES WERE BLANK

MM talked to Dean about trees and she talked about mature trees and flowering.

We considered the letter from MR (?) Hamilton (?) where he objected to the attached garages. RR pointed out that garage position does not increase the mass because they are under the room in the rear. SK pointed out that a detached garage would make the small lots even more crowded.

DB moved the findings and conditions and materials list. RR seconded the motion.

HDC asked for an extension until the 29th and the applicant agreed to this extension. Unanimous approval of the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 11:20 pm.